

Intra-crisis learning and prospective policy transfer in the Covid-19 pandemic

Powell, Martin; King-Hill, Sophie

DOI:

[10.1108/IJSSP-07-2020-0339](https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-07-2020-0339)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Powell, M & King-Hill, S 2020, 'Intra-crisis learning and prospective policy transfer in the Covid-19 pandemic', *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, vol. 40, no. 9-10, pp. 877-892.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSSP-07-2020-0339>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



**Intra-crisis learning and Prospective Policy Transfer in the
Covid-19 Pandemic**

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy</i>
Manuscript ID	IJSSP-07-2020-0339.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Covid-19, Lesson drawing, Prospective Policy Transfer, intra-crisis learning, literature review

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Awareness		Assessment			Application	
	Scope of Information	Adequacy and Accuracy of Information	Similarity of Problems and Goals	Policy Performance	Differences in Setting	
De Bruin	International examples of effectiveness	Limited detail	System at risk of collapse; Risk mitigation	Some early signs of effectiveness for each category of mitigation in a number of countries	Note that settings important	Too early to tell; little advice
Chen	China and USA	Limited detail	‘Unprecedented global public health challenge’; little on goals	China more successful in contact tracing than the USA.	Note differences between USA and China	USA could learn from China
Duong	Vietnam (Positive)	Limited detail	Little on problems or goals	Few cases and no deaths; international acclaim	Implies that strategy transferable	Clear lessons, notably early and decisive action.
Edelman	Past (HIV)	Limited detail	Little on problems or goals	Not clear	Differences diseases, but some common features	Experiences with HIV can serve as a guidepost
Forman	International examples	Limited detail	‘Tremendous economic and social	Poor overall response, but	Lessons appear to be	Only lesson of ‘decisive leadership’ clearly drawn from international experience

			costs of this pandemic.’	some nations have performed well	universally applicable.	
Ha	Korea (negative)	Limited detail	Little on problems, but ultimate goal of eliminating the virus	Poor response	Little on settings	Korea must learn from its mistakes.
Hasselgren	Past (Smallpox)	Limited detail	Little on problems or goals	Inoculation against smallpox was successful	Many similarities with previous pandemics	Innoculation of limited relevance as no vaccine
Islam	China + international evidence	Limited detail	Goal of controlling the current outbreak	Chinese success as a ‘role model for the world’	Discuss transferability	Recommend a three phase approach
Jaiswal	Past (AIDS)	Limited detail	Goal of understanding the impact on and importance of the Public Health response	Limited success	Diseases different, but transferability not explored	Suggest lessons associated with communication
Jhaveri	Past (2009 H1N1 Influenza Pandemic)	Limited detail	Goals of blunting the first wave and to manage health system surge capacity	Limited success	Diseases different, but transferability not explored	Suggest lessons of being prepared and taking action quickly
Jones	Past (Pandemics)	Limited detail	Discusses risks, but with little on detailed goals	Mix of past successes and failures	Little on transferability	Lessons not fully clear
Lee	Sinagpore (Positive)	Some detail	Goal of containing the spread early of	Singapore successful	Little on transferability	Suggests joined up rapid strategies

			the virus			
Marshall	Past (Zika)	Limited detail	Little on problems or goals	Mainly past failures	Little on transferability	Suggests lessons from Zika
Moon	Korea (Positive)	Some detail	Goal of mitigating the initial surge	Korea successful	Transfer difficult	Suggests public cooperation, preparation and rapid responses
Oh	Korea (Positive)	Some detail	Goals of lowering the incidence of new cases and sustaining a low mortality rate.	Korea successful	Transfer difficult	Advocates preparedness and rapid action
Olagnier	Denmark (Positive)	Some detail	Goals of low rates of infections and low death rates	Denmark successful	Transfer difficult	Suggest trust in government and rapid action, communication and cooperation
Rahimi	China + international evidence	Limited detail	Unclear	Unclear	Transfer difficult	Recommend joined up, international responses
Romagnani	Italy (Positive and negative regions)	Some detail	Goals of controlling the spread of the virus and mitigating the epidemic impacts	Policy failure	Little on transferability	Advocate a joined up international response
Ruiu	Italy (Negative)	Some detail	Goals of limiting the spread of the virus and limiting the spread of ‘both chaos and panic’	Policy failure	Little on transferability	Advises a coordinated approach by all agencies involved, quick action and planning and resource availability
Wilson	New Zealand (Positive)	Some detail	Goals of ‘achieving rapid and complete control over the	New Zealand successful	Little on transferability	Advises measures including trust in the government and the ability of the government to be led by expertise and the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

			COVID-19 outbreak – not just ‘flattening the curve’			mobilisation of the population
--	--	--	---	--	--	--------------------------------

Intra-crisis learning and Prospective Policy Transfer in the Covid-19 Pandemic

Abstract

Purpose

This article brings together the literatures on policy learning and lesson drawing with the intra-crisis learning literature in order to assess ‘learning lessons’ in the Covid-19 Pandemic.

Design

It carries out a structured review of articles that seek to provide lessons for the Pandemic. It examines these articles using Interpretative Content Analysis to apply the criteria of Prospective Policy Transfer to the material.

Findings

Application of the criteria of Prospective Policy Transfer suggests that lesson drawing was fairly limited. It is often not fully clear why nations were selected. Many articles were brief and provided limited detail, meaning that there was little depth on issues such as problems and goals, and on policy performance or policy success or failure. There was limited discussion of transferability of lessons, and few clear lessons could be drawn. Finally, the extent to which it was possible to learn lessons in a non-routine’ or ‘less routine’ crisis, under conditions of threat, uncertainty, and urgency was generally not discussed.

Research limitations/implications (if applicable)

Practical implications (if applicable)

The criteria within the framework of Prospective Policy Transfer provides a template for policy-makers to assess lessons.

Social implications (if applicable)

Originality/value (mandatory)

This article indicates the problems of attempting to draw lessons from the past or from other nations to an unprecedented crisis, where decision-making is characterised by elements of threat, urgency and uncertainty.

Keywords

COVID-19; Lesson drawing; Prospective Policy Transfer; Crisis decision-making; Literature Review;

Research Article

Introduction

This article brings together the literatures on policy learning and lesson drawing with the intra-crisis learning literature in order to assess 'learning lessons' in the Covid 19 Pandemic. It examines the problems of 'lessons' within a crisis, focusing on the supply of lessons that seek to provide information of learning from the past (eg previous Pandemics) or from abroad. It draws together elements from the Mossberger and Wolman (2003) framework of Prospective Policy Transfer, the learning perspective (the type and source of lessons) and the crisis perspective (threat, uncertainty, and urgency in a non-routine and intra-crisis situation).

Governments in many nations stressed the importance of evidence-based policy making (EBPM), including learning from abroad, but policy making documents advocating this often do not consider how policy makers can incorporate evidence into policy (Legrand 2012).

Governments have often lacked a practical evaluation framework for selecting policy measures and then appraising the feasibility and transferability of such measures (Williams and Dzhekova 2014). Few studies have combined the EBPM and learning from abroad literatures (but see eg Ingold and Monaghan 2016; Legrand 2012). Moreover, most of the learning from abroad literature focuses on 'normal' rather than 'crisis' policy making, and so does not recognise the huge problems of crisis decision making (eg Boin et al 2018; Moynihan 2008, 2009).

The structure of the article is as follows. It first discusses policy learning and lesson drawing, including the notion of Prospective Policy Transfer (Mossberger and Wolman 2003). It then uses Interpretative Content Analysis to examine the articles, before applying the criteria of

the Prospective Policy Transfer framework to the material. It then brings the material together with sections of Discussion and Conclusions.

Learning from Abroad

Reviews of policy learning over many years (eg Bennett and Howlett 1992; Vagionaki and Trein 2019) focused on a set of broadly similar topics and questions. For example, Bennett and Howlett (1992) discussed the subject of learning (who learns?); the object of learning (learns what?); and the results of learning (to what effect?). The reviews also generally discussed a category of ‘lesson drawing’ which included the work of Rose (1991, 1993), known as the author who coined the concept ‘lesson-drawing’ for public policy. Rose points out that lessons can be sought by searching across time and/or across space, with the critical question of whether a programme that is successful in one setting can be transferred to another. This means attention to both evaluating its initial effect in situ and the probability of transfer, which can be placed on a spectrum from perfect or total transferability (or ‘fungibility’) to total blockage.

Much of the ‘lesson drawing’ and ‘policy transfer’ literatures paid limited attention to learning (eg Legrand 2012). From the learning perspective, Heikkila and Gerlak (2013) argued that information acquisition, translation, and dissemination phases of learning are largely ignored in the policy literature. Wolman and Page (2002) examined policy transfer as an instance of policy learning, adopting a communications and information framework that focuses on information networks, including producers, senders, and facilitators of information as well as recipients. In particular, they pointed out that virtually all

1
2
3 policy-transfer studies focus almost entirely on the receivers of information and the use they
4
5 make of it, rather than on senders and providers.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Williams and Dzhekova (2014) review the literature on cross-national policy transfer,
12
13 focusing on the main approaches associated with policy transfer, and obstacles and factors for
14
15 success of policy transfer. They argue that the extensive literature on policy transfer and
16
17 lesson-drawing recognizes a number of problems associated with the process of extrapolating
18
19 “lessons” and best practices and applying them to a different context. They discuss
20
21 Prospective Policy Transfer (below), before suggesting a practical framework for the rapid
22
23 appraisal of prospective policy measures, including criteria/questions to be asked when
24
25 assessing the applicability (generalizability) and transferability (feasibility) of policy.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Mossberger and Wolman (2003) focused on policy makers' attempts to assess the effect of a
34
35 policy or program before it is put in place, which is called prospective policy evaluation, a
36
37 term coined by Rose (1991, 1993). They proposed criteria for assessing policy transfer as a
38
39 form of prospective policy evaluation: awareness (scope of information; adequacy and
40
41 accuracy of information); assessment (similarity of problems and goals; policy performance;
42
43 differences in setting); and application (whether information about the policy in another
44
45 country is actually used in the decision process). They then reviewed 17 case studies of cross-
46
47 national policy transfer (mainly academic journal articles and texts) to ask to what extent they
48
49 meet their “rational” criteria (see below). They then proceeded to a set of recommendations
50
51 based on recognizing problems and coping through bounded rationality: information sources
52
53 (mixed scanning as a heuristic; multiple sources); ‘awareness of problems and criticism;
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

consideration of potential conflicts with new goals; limited learning or prediction; awareness of supporting policies and institutions; and uncertainty in prospective evaluation' (see below).

Learning and Crisis

The cross-national lesson drawing and policy transfer literatures operate in 'normal' times, but 'normal policy making' is very different from learning in a crisis (eg Moynihan 2008, 2009). Many commentators drew on the definition of a crisis by Rosenthal et al (1989, p. 10), with its constituent elements of threat, uncertainty, and urgency (eg Moynihan 2008, 2009; Boin et al 2018). According to Boin et al (2018), crises created impossible conditions for those who seek to manage a response operation, forcing them to make urgent decisions while essential information about causes and consequences remains unavailable, unreliable or incomplete.

It is broadly argued that lesson-drawing was one of the most underdeveloped aspects of crisis management (eg Boin et al 2018). The literature distinguished learning across crises and learning within a crisis, or inter-crisis and intra-crisis management (Moynihan 2009).

Moynihan (2008, 2009) wrote that we know less about intra-crisis learning, which may be more difficult than, inter-crisis learning. Brändström et al (2004) explored cases where decision-makers draw on history in managing a current crisis or 'coping with crisis by searching the past'. They differentiated learning in crises (the use of historical analogies during crisis decision-making) and learning from crises (the extent to which crises provide opportunities for policy-oriented learning). It is important to take into account the additional problems of intra-crisis learning with its constituent elements of threat, uncertainty, and urgency (eg Moynihan 2008, 2009; Boin et al 2018; Weible et al 2020). Lessons must be

1
2
3 learnt quickly in real time and based on evidence with large confidence limits and subject to
4
5 change. Moynihan (2008, 2009) also differentiated between 'routine' and 'non-routine' or
6
7 'less routine' crises. In routine crises, standard procedures that work well in one setting can
8
9 usually be applied to another, such as in forest fires or earthquakes. In such a setting,
10
11 successful inter-crisis learning reduced the need for intra-crisis learning. However, less
12
13 familiar crises with non-routine tasks were more difficult to manage.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **Method**

22
23 We searched Web of Science for 2020 using the terms 'Covid AND lessons' on 13 July 2020,
24
25 resulting in 429 articles. Many of the vast number of articles on Covid-19 suggest at least
26
27 implicit lessons, but we focused on explicit 'lessons' in the Title, Abstract, or Keywords. This
28
29 brought up lessons from other nations and from previous Pandemics. With the lag-time
30
31 associated with academic publishing, most articles were written during the growth and peak
32
33 of the Pandemic in the nations of origin of most of the authors (Europe and the USA).
34
35 Inclusion criteria included: lessons learned from both time and space in relation to policy. In
36
37 other words, the article had to produce a lesson from either the past or from another nation.
38
39 Applying the inclusion criteria through reading Titles and Abstracts left a final list of 20
40
41 articles.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This study uses Interpretive Content Analysis (ICA) (Drisko and Maschi 2016). It uses a
51
52 deductive approach that focuses on both manifest and latent content. A deductive approach is
53
54 useful if the general aim is to test a previous theory, and keywords are derived from the
55
56 interest of researchers or review of literature. CA may also be focused on manifest or latent
57
58 content. Manifest CA involves analyzing for the appearance of a particular word or content,
59
60

while latent CA refers to the process of interpretation of content, or discovering underlying meanings of the words or the content. In addition to key words, it drew on connotative codes, which are based not on explicit words but on the overall or symbolic meaning of phrases or passages.

Prospective Policy Evaluation for Covid-19

This section examines the material from the sources cited by the reports drawing on the Mossberger and Wolman (2003) criteria of prospective policy transfer.

Awareness: Scope of Information.

This section examines the sources of lessons, and the justification for that choice. Mossberger and Wolman (2003) suggested that policies selected for emulation would be those that have proven successful (see below), have been implemented in countries with important similarities, or have addressed a similar problem (see below).

de Bruin et al (2020) examined the initial impacts of global risk mitigation measures taken during the COVID-19 pandemic. In particular, they reviewed early signs of effectiveness under the categories of Mobility Restrictions (China); socio-economic restrictions (reduced mobility in most European countries); physical distancing; hygiene measures (temporary prohibited of wild life markets in China; encouragement of wearing face masks in public in some Asian and EU nations);communication (trustworthy and well-coordinated communication channels to create community trust and compliance in Hong Kong, Singapore, Japan and Korea) and international support mechanisms.

Chen et al (2020) presented four key lessons (effective surveillance, reporting, and contact tracing; multi-sectoral efforts; sustained and routine prevention efforts; and a strong public health system) learned from efforts to address the pandemic in China and the US. Duong et al (2020) presented lessons from the 'limited resource country' of Vietnam. They pointed out that despite being one of the earliest countries influenced by the pandemic, Vietnam has received the world's acclaim for its low-cost and effective strategy in their fight against COVID-19. The lessons learned from what Vietnam has done so far could stand out as an example of how to do more with less.

Edelman et al (2020) explored how lessons from HIV can inform the response to COVID-19. Forman et al (2020) provided 12 Lessons learned from the management of the coronavirus pandemic, seemingly drawn from 'vignettes' of international evidence. They mentioned nations such as China, USA, Brazil, UK, Korea, New Zealand, Germany, Finland, Iceland and Taiwan, France, and international organisations such as the EU, WB, and WHO. Ha (2020) suggested that Korea is in urgent need of moving away from a divided community approach and adopting a total community approach.

Hasselgren (2020) explored lessons from the Smallpox Epidemics in America in the 1700s, as the 'many similarities between events during the 1700s and today's onslaught by the coronavirus are remarkable'. However, most of the article focused on inoculation, although there is no effective COVID-19 vaccine. Islam et al (2020) carried out a review of articles focusing on human coronaviruses, including SARS, MERS, and COVID-19 virus with their epidemiology, transmission dynamics, and current situation of the outbreak, and prevention

and control measures. They focused on the three phases undertaken by China that could be adopted by other countries, because China was the country where the first epidemic started, and was also the first success story too. They argued that basic approaches quite similar to China, primarily focusing on test, isolation, and quarantine, largely controlled the virus in Korea, Japan, and Norway. However, according to studies in their review (Table 3), nations that failed to control the virus were France, Iran, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, UK and USA, mainly for reasons such as limited testing and tracing, and being late in enforcing lockdowns.

According to Jaiswal et al (2020), disinformation, misinformation and inequality-driven mistrust were 'lessons unlearned from AIDS denialism'. Jhaveri (2020) examined 'echoes of 2009 H1N1 Influenza Pandemic in the COVID Pandemic' Jones (2020) outlined lessons from previous Pandemics. Lee et al (2020) suggested that although Singapore was one of the first countries to be affected by COVID-19, and for a while was the country with the highest case numbers outside China, its comprehensive surveillance system strategy, coupled with community-based measures proportionate to the transmission risk, has been effective in containing spread. Marshall et al (2020) considered if lessons could be learned from the response to Florida's Zika outbreak in 2016-2018.

Moon (2020) claimed that unlike many Western countries, Korea has been able to contain the spread of COVID-19 without a harsh forced lockdown of the epicentre of the virus, arguing that an agile-adaptive approach, a policy of transparency in communicating risk, and citizens' voluntary cooperation were critical factors. Oh et al (2020) examined the 'strong national response' in Korea. Olganier and Mogensen (2020) presented 'big lessons from a small country' of Denmark. They discussed whether geographical, demographical, and

governmental factors can explain the Danish success in fighting Covid-19, before arguing that trust and Danish culture were critical factors. They concluded that overall, it is probably not a single factor, but the sum of different factors, that together have contributed to the effective management of the coronavirus crisis.

Rahimi and Abadi (2020) noted that different countries affected by the COVID-19 outbreak have responded discrepantly, but a uniform strategy is required to tackle this pandemic. They then proposed five mandatory measures to efficiently control and tackle any present or future outbreaks of COVID-19. However, the evidence appeared rather loose, and only mentions China. Romagnani et al (2020) focused on lessons from the Italian experience of Covid-19. More specifically, they contrast the testing strategy of the two regions of Lombardy and Veneto, concluding that the latter was more successful than the former. Ruiu (2020) pointed to lessons learned from the 'mismanagement' of Covid-19 in Italy, which was one of the most affected countries in the world. Wilson (2020) focused on the leadership approach and practices of the New Zealand government, notably adopting the ambitious goal of achieving rapid and complete control over the COVID-19 outbreak, rather than just 'flattening the curve'.

Awareness: Adequacy and Accuracy of Information

Mossberger and Wolman (2003) focused on the accuracy of information about the goals, design, and actual operation of policies. However, as they discuss similarity of problems and goals, and policy performance in other criteria (below), this section examines the level of detail. They wrote that in most cases, borrowing countries appeared to have reasonably accurate and detailed knowledge about the mechanics of the programme. However, this

tended to be gathered through study visits and conferences, and programme evaluations and material from critics were sometimes lacking.

There is inevitably some trade-off between breadth and depth, with articles focusing on one nation able to provide greater detail. de Bruin et al (2020) examined early signs of effectiveness across nations for their six categories in a page or so, making it difficult to provide much detail. Chen et al (2020) discussed four key lessons (effective surveillance, reporting, and contact tracing; multi-sectoral efforts; sustained and routine prevention efforts; and a strong public health system) for China and the US in a three page article. Duong et al (2020) was unable to provide much detail in a two page letter, but set out key interventions chronologically in a Table. Edelman et al (2020) covered seven 'critical observations and lessons to be learned' in some three pages. Forman et al (2020) discussed 12 Lessons within a short article, and so details on each are necessarily thin. Ha (2020) was unable to provide much detail in an article of some two pages. Hasselgren (2020) focused mainly on smallpox inoculation, although there is no effective COVID-19 vaccine. Islam et al (2020) provided some detail on China, but international evidence from their review was briefly summarised in a Table. Jaiswal et al (2020) provide limited detail in some three pages of text. Jhaveri (2020) examined the 2009 H1N1 Influenza Pandemic, with just over one page devoted to 'Lessons from 2009 that are relevant to the Covid-19 Public Health response'.

In a brief article of some three pages, Jones (2020) focused most attention on past Pandemics. Lee et al (2020) provided some detail on Singapore's approach, including surveillance and containment, healthcare, community and social, and border control measures, comparing them with selected other nations (their Table 1). Marshall et al (2020) mainly contained a

descriptive qualitative case study of Florida's response to Zika, with the section on 'Insights into COVID-19 Response' taking up just over one page. Moon (2020) provided some detail on the Korean strategy. Oh et al (2020) provided a detailed account of Korea's response. Olagnier and Mogensen (2020) discussed the Danish "Act fast and act with force" approach, in the context of geographical, demographical, and governmental factors, as well as trust and Danish culture. Rahimi and Abadi (2020) were unable to provide much detail on their 'five mandatory measures' in an article of some three pages. Romagnani et al (2020) focused on lessons from the Italian experience of Covid-19. More specifically, they contrasted the testing strategy of the two regions of Lombardy and Veneto, concluding that the latter was more successful than the former. Ruii (2020) discussed political, scientific, media and public responses, stressing five communication weaknesses of outbreak management in Italy. Wilson (2020) set New Zealand's 'go hard, and go early' approach within the broader national context and leadership style.

Assessment: Similarity of Problems and Goals

According to Mossberger and Wolman (2003), potential adopters must identify which problem(s) the policy has been used to address and the associated goals, and then determine the extent to which these are similar to the problems they face and the goals they wish to pursue. They pointed out that one frequently cited reason for unsuccessful policy transfer is the effort to transplant a policy that was intended to serve one purpose in the originating country to serve other ends in the borrowing country.

de Bruin et al (2020) noted that at the time of writing, the Italian health care remains on the brink of collapse experiencing innumerable numbers of hospitalised patients, a scarcity of

intensive care beds, medical staff), PPEs, ventilators and medicines. Moreover, other countries, including Spain and the United States, also experienced similar challenges in different degrees. They focused on 'risk mitigation': controlling the infection to prevent the spread of COVID-19 is regarded as the only intervention that could be used. Chen et al (2020) regarded Covid-19 as an 'unprecedented global public health challenge', with the growing number of deaths, and has placed millions of people in full or partial quarantine, disrupted commerce, and caused meltdowns of the global financial market, but do not seem to provide much explicit precision on goals. Duong et al (2020) provided little explicit detail on problems or goals, beyond stating that for Vietnam the major challenge is now to control potential community transmission clusters. Edelman et al (2020) said little about problems or goals. Forman et al (2020) pointed to the 'tremendous economic and social costs of this pandemic.' Ha (2020) said little about problems or goals, but is one of the few studies that regard Korea as a negative lesson of 'a divided community approach.' It regarded the ultimate goal as eliminating the virus from the country.

Hasselgren (2020) discussed problems associated with smallpox, but says little about goals. Islam et al (2020) stated that controlling COVID-19 in the future and points to goals of controlling the current outbreak and prevention strategies. Jaiswal et al (2020) pointed to goals of understanding the impact on and importance of the Public Health response of disinformation, misinformation and mistrust.

Jhaveri (2020) discussed 'goals' of social distancing in order to 'blunt the first wave' and to manage health system surge capacity. Jones (2020) discussed risks, but with little on detailed goals. Lee et al (2020) outlined goals of containing the spread early of the virus. Marshall et al (2020) gave little mention of specific goals. Moon (2020) outlined the goals of mitigating

the initial surge of COVID-19. Oh et al (2020) pointed to the ‘intentions and goals’ of lowering the incidence of new cases and sustaining a low mortality rate. According to Olagnier and Mogensen (2020), the goals were low rates of infections and low death rates. While Rahimi and Abadi (2020) gave some mention to managing the present and future outbreaks, there seem to be no more specific goals related to this. Romagnani et al (2020) pointed to the overall goals of controlling the spread of the virus and mitigating the epidemic impacts. Ruiiu (2020) discussed goals of limiting the spread of the virus and limiting the spread of ‘both chaos and panic’. Wilson (2020) was more specific, pointing to New Zealand’s goals of ‘achieving rapid and complete control over the COVID-19 outbreak – not just ‘flattening the curve’ as other countries are struggling to do.

Assessment: Policy performance

Mossberger and Wolman (2003) stressed that policy makers should assess the extent to which the policy they wish to emulate was successful, or the respects in which it was successful. However, this was in many ways the most difficult dilemma in the policy transfer process, with problems of selection bias (more information from programme advocates than critics; and few evaluations). The unsystematic and un-structured means of information gathering about policies can lead to policy making by anecdote rather than by analysis.

De Bruin et al (2020) discussed early signs of effectiveness for each category of mitigation. In particular they state that early analysis of the Wuhan COVID-19 outbreak suggest that the effects of travel limitations are important for national and international agencies dealing with public health response planning (mobility restrictions) and that individual behaviour is crucial

in controlling the spread of COVID-19. They cited Anderson et al (2020) that the application of a combination of mitigation measures such as physical distancing in combination with the ban of mass gatherings, good diagnostic facilities and remotely accessed health advice, together with specialised treatment for people with severe COVID-19 infections, was suggested to lead to a 60% reduction in transmission. They concluded that the highest effect is obtained by applying a combination of measures representing different aims. However, it seemed that policy performance is not good as in Europe, in the current major hotspots in Italy and Spain, and recently in the US, in New York, hospitals were being overwhelmed. Chen et al (2020) stated that China appears to be more successful in contact tracing than the USA. Duong et al (2020) pointed out that to date (April 10, 2020), Vietnam has had 255 confirmed cases and no deaths due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and has received acclaim for its management of the virus.

It was not fully clear if Edelman et al (2020) regarded policy performance associated with HIV as a success. Forman et al (2020) noted that although it would be many months or even years before the final verdict can be reached, 'we believe that it is already possible to identify 12 key lessons'. They pointed out that while some nations have performed well, in global terms the Pandemic has close to five million cases and over 300,000 deaths. As noted above, Ha (2020) claimed that Korea is in urgent need of moving away from a divided community approach. Hasselgren (2020) noted that, despite opposition in some quarters, inoculation against smallpox was successful. Islam et al (2020) stated that China demonstrated success as a 'role model for the world' with a three phase rapid approach, prevention, reduction of new cases, reduction of clusters. Jaiswal et al (2020) discussed the lack of success of the lack of communication had upon certain groups in society in relation to COVID-19. This was similar to the AIDS crisis, suggesting that lessons had not been learned.

Jhaveri (2020) pointed to a lack of success as action was not taken quickly enough and plans were not in place for a major outbreak such as Covid-19. Jones (2020) stated that diseases are unpredictable and hard to plan for, but provides some mention of the successes of quarantine, testing and social distancing of previous Pandemics, but also of the failures as a result of poor planning and stigma. Lee et al (2020) argued that Singapore was successful, which was dependent upon concise government action, coupled with a combination of measures such as surveillance, containment, healthcare and border control.

Marshall et al (2020) focused on failures in relation to Zika on rapid results, and public knowledge about transmission. The discussion of COVID-19 was more speculative, but indicative of failure again in these areas. Moon (2020) linked the success of Korea to learning and preparedness from the previous MERs outbreak. Oh et al (2020) pointed to success associated with hospital capacity, TTT, rapid response and mobilisation. They stated that this was due in part to past learning from MERS.

Olagnier and Mogensen (2020) argued that the Danish 'Act fast and act with force' policies were successful and performed well, alongside public cooperation and clear communication. There was little mention of overall success or failure of approaches in Rahimi and Abadi (2020) as the discussion was global. However, they claimed that more preparation internationally was required and measures needed to be put in place in relation to movement, quarantine, livestock and resources where existing policies have failed. Romagnani et al (2020) pointed to policy failure in Italy, which performed poorly due to a lack of streamlined protocols and procedures. Rui (2020) highlighted a failure of policies from lack of

coordination and rapid response, coupled with poor PPE resources, which meant that the approaches taken performed poorly. Wilson (2020) discussed successful policy based upon the leadership, and linked to rapid response, science led and trust in government.

Assessment: Differences in Setting

An assessment should be made of the extent to which particular features of the new policy environment differ from the policy's original setting, and whether these differences matter for implementation or outcomes (Mosberger and Wolman 2003). For their literature review, they questioned whether policy makers in the borrowing unit identify important differences in the policy or programme setting.

de Bruin et al (2020) noted that settings and type of governments impact upon how the policies are introduced, the communication and how rapidly they can be implemented, which was dependent upon resources and compliance. The rules and policies adopted by many countries differed as well as societal and population structure, and healthcare systems. They concluded that success is dependent upon how rapidly the risk mitigation strategies can be applied and are reliant upon citizen's trust, resources and clear multi-agency, national and international communication. Chen et al (2020) noted differences between USA and China, but it is less clear how these relate to policy transfer. Duong et al (2020) showed that a nation can do 'more with less', with a low-cost and effective strategy in their fight against COVID-19. Edelman et al (2020) stated that while HIV/AIDS and COVID-19 are entirely different diseases with different modes of transmission and natural history, both require confronting denial of their danger and similar and specific clinical and public health approaches.

Forman et al (2020) did not seem to consider that context is important, as their 12 lessons appear to be universally applicable. Ha (2020) said little about settings, beyond the claim of a divided community approach. Hasselgren (2020) argued that the COVID-19 pandemic offers many similarities with previous pandemics hitting our country. In particular, the smallpox epidemics during the 1700s threatened the lives of multitudes and created panic and fear in the society, similar to the situation caused by the coronavirus. However, much of his article concerned inoculation, but there is no vaccine for Covid-19. Islam et al (2020) implied that transferability is dependent upon the governments' abilities and whether they can move quickly and decisively. Comparators with other countries demonstrate where failures were evident in comparison to the approach by China due to slow action and less stringent measures.

Jaiswal et al (2020) appeared to assume that suggestions can be made without a large consideration of time contexts. They noted that the timeframes and the nature of the disease is different, but issues of transferability are not directly explored. Jhaveri (2020) noted major differences relating to the nature of H1N1 and COVID-19, but transferability issues with the actions taken with H1N1 and COVID-19 measures are not explored in detail. Jones (2020) gave little in depth consideration to different spatial or time contexts and transferability of the approaches discussed. Lee et al (2020) offered comparisons to measures in other countries measures, but no detailed discussion of issues with context and transferability issues is provided. Marshall et al (2020) discussed only the Florida context, without much consideration of transferability. Moon (2020) argued that adapting and transferring Korean policies to Western countries may be difficult due to the lack of public trust, lack of past experience (SARs/MERs), and the ability to act quickly.

Oh et al (2020) discussed that transferability may be difficult as other countries have not had the experience of SARs/MERs and that ‘decisive central leadership and a strong decentralized system open to the repurposing and flexible reallocation of resources and depended on political leadership and a commitment and willingness to try innovative responses’ need to be present and considered when transferring the polices discussed. Olagnier and Mogensen (2020) outlined that transferability may be difficult due to demographical differences which are key in prevention alongside rapid action. They also outlined the uniqueness of the cultural position with widespread trust in the government that may not be present elsewhere. Rahimi and Abadi (2020) discussed that differences in settings may make international working difficult due to demographical and cultural differences but did not give any in depth consideration to issues of transferability across nations. Romagnani et al (2020) discussed protocols and strategies, but with little attention to issues of transferability. Ruiu (2020) did not discuss how the measures implemented and suggested can be transferred across settings and contexts. Wilson (2020) offered little consideration or discussion on issues of transferability across contexts.

Application

The final criterion of Mossberger and Wolman (2003) was whether information about the policy in another country is actually used in the decision process, with application premised on adequate information about and assessment of the nature of the problem, policy goals, policy performance, and the policy environment. Clearly, these documents were not produced by government, and so this section examines if the documents made a clear recommendation based on lessons from other nations or from the past.

De Bruin et al (2020) concluded that it is too early to detect the impact of different mitigation strategies, making it is not yet possible to give quantitative advice. Chen et al (2020) implied that the USA could learn from China on issues such as surveillance, reporting, and contact tracing. Duong et al (2020) provided four clear lessons: a strong political commitment and prompt actions with the engagement of stakeholders; best risk communication practice; Intensive surveillance, case management, contact tracing, and large-scale health quarantine; and series of suspension for flights, shutting schools, and closing all public places. However, the Table of Key COVID-19 Interventions suggested the importance of early and decisive action. Edelman et al (2020) concluded that the decades of experiences with HIV can serve as a guidepost as for the Covid-19 Pandemic. Forman et al's (2020) 12 lessons did not seem to be closely drawn from national experience, apart from 'decisive leadership' in nations such as China (slightly belatedly), Korea, New Zealand, Germany, Finland, Iceland and Taiwan. Ha (2020) implied that Korea must learn from its mistakes. Given that there is no vaccine for Covid-19, Hasselgren's (2020) recommendation of smallpox inoculation was of limited relevance.

Islam et al (2020) recommended a three phase approach: prevention/isolation/surveillance; restrictions/treatments; and reduce clusters/enhance evidence/use data. Jaiswal et al (2020) recommended that the following lessons be adapted from the AIDS crisis to COVID-19: recognition of misinformation and mistrust; and better understanding by public health of how to communicate clear and transparent information to marginal groups. Jhaveri (2020) suggested that being prepared and also taking action quickly is key (i.e social distancing/school closures) and that preparation for a second wave of infections should be underway. Jones (2020) argued that we learn from the past in context, referring to hindsight

with stigma and health professional deaths and exaggerated fears as risk factors. Lee et al (2020) advocated that governments adopt joined up rapid strategies to negate a large outbreak utilising a range of methods gained from SARS. i.e containment/surveillance, healthcare, border control, social/community measures. Marshall et al (2020) suggested that strategies and failures from Zika can be applied in the instance of Covid-19 and mistakes made can be learned from 'coordination of resources, essential services and treatment, data collection, communication among public health and healthcare systems, and dissemination of information, community education, testing accuracy and turnaround time, financing, and continuity of health services'.

Moon (2020) argued for a focus on public cooperation, preparation and rapid responses to an outbreak. Oh et al (2020) advocated preparedness and rapid action based upon robust planning and communication strategies. Olganier and Mogensen (2020) stated that successful application comes from trust in government and rapid action, communication and cooperation. Rahimi and Abadi (2020) recommended that joined up, international responses are required to a number of elements rather than applicability to just one setting. i.e livestock trading, vaccine projects, rapid quarantine measures, PPE supply, regulation and provision. Romagnani et al (2020) advocated a joined up international response to the outbreak and further outbreaks. Ruiu (2020) advised a coordinated approach by all agencies involved, quick action and planning and resource availability. Wilson (2020) advised measures including trust in the government and the ability of the government to be led by expertise and the mobilisation of the population.

Discussion

Table 1 sums up how the articles fared according to the criteria of Prospective Policy Transfer (Mossberger and Wolman 2003). A wide variety of nations are covered under 'Scope of Information', with some articles covering a range of nations (eg review) while others focused on single nations. The criteria for selection were not always clear. Reviews presented the results of their search, while it was sometimes clear that a single nation presented either a positive (eg Korea, New Zealand) or negative lesson (eg Italy). Most positive lessons came from nations that had seen fewer cases and deaths (see eg Worldometer). Many of these have been covered in other sources such as news media (Author Ref). It was good to see lessons from some nations that have not been extensively covered such as Vietnam, but surprising not to see more focus on Germany. On the other hand, there were some 'dogs that did not bark' in that nations such as Greece, and some East European nations with low case numbers and deaths were not mentioned. Moreover, it was not clear that nations had been chosen on the basis of important similarities or similar problems (Mossberger and Wolman 2003). This was particularly the case for lessons from the past.

The criterion of 'adequacy and accuracy of information' was limited by the brevity of many of the articles, making providing much detail problematic, especially if they attempted to cover more than one nation. There were very few long articles that focused on one nation (but see Olganier and Mogensen (2020) on Denmark).

Similarly, there was limited detail on problems and goals. The 'rational policy process' approach clearly links problems and goals. For example, if lack of hospital capacity is seen as a problem, then the associated goal may be to rapidly increase that capacity, as in the

construction of the 'Nightingale' hospitals in the UK. Problems broadly included health systems being overwhelmed, and issues such as lack of PPE. Goals were often vague. For example, it was unclear if the goal was mitigation '(flattening the curve) or eradication (eg New Zealand).

Similarly, as goals tended to be unclear, policy performance or policy success or failure was often also not clear. Drawing on the policy success literature, Weible et al (2020) argue that success or failure can be judged as part of decisions, processes, and politics, containing multiple narratives and versions. For example, it might be argued that the UK succeeded on rapidly increasing hospital capacity, but failed on just about every other possible criterion.

Relatively limited attention was paid to 'Settings', with some studies appearing to assume perfect transferability or 'fungibility' of lessons (Rose 1991). A few articles did note that transfer may be problematic (eg Moon 2020; Oh et al 2020; Olganier and Mogensen 2020; Rahimi and Abadi 2020), particularly with respect to factors such as national culture and trust in the government. Moreover, lessons must be related to 'real time'. Stressing preparedness is similar to the old story of 'I wouldn't start from here': while they are wise words for any future Pandemic, it is difficult for any nation to build the infrastructure that (eg) Korea took some years to do after SARS in a matter of weeks, although Germany increased its testing capacity very quickly. Even when there was some discussion of settings, it was often unclear how these related to transferability.

Finally, for 'Application', few clear recommendations were made. Some lessons were suggested (eg Duong 2020; Forman et al 2020). The main lessons seemed to be on surveillance and contact tracing (eg Chen et al 2020; Duong et al 2020; Lee et al 2020); early and decisive leadership (eg Forman et al 2020; Jhaveri 2020; Marshall et al 2020; Moon 2020; Olganier and Mogensen 2020; Ruiiu 2020); communication (Duong et al 2020; Olganier and Mogensen(2020); border control (eg Duong et al 2020); joined up strategies and co-operation (Lee et al 2020; Marshall et al 2020; Moon 2020; .Rahimi and Abadi 2020; Romagnani et al 2020); trust in government (Olganier and Mogensen (2020; Wilson 2020); and preparedness (eg Moon 2020; Oh et al 2020). However, partly associated with the lack of detail (above), lessons were often fairly broad. For example, 'lockdown' may have many different elements such as speed (relative to time of first case or death), harshness (eg stay at home apart from essentials such as food and medicine), and compliance and enforcement. For example, Dergiades et al (2020) found that for 32 nations, the greater the strength of government interventions at an early stage, the more effective these are in slowing down or reversing the growth rate of deaths. Similarly, for the lessons from the past, some form of 'Quarantine' has been practiced to combat infectious disease since the 1370s.

Williams and Dzhekova (2014) point to the need to strike a balance between de-contextualization and over-contextualization of potential foreign policies. It seems that most of the studies above tend towards de-contextualizing potential policies for transfer, as they focus too much on outputs, results and impacts, which result in a blending out of the contextual variables. In other words, they tend to pay insufficient attention to contextualizing factors or applicability (feasibility) assessment, whether it is possible to provide the intervention in the local setting, such as the political climate/leverage; political barriers; social acceptability; locally tailored intervention; available essential resources and identified

organization(s) to provide intervention; organizational expertise; and capacity.

Few of the articles discuss the crisis literature, and perhaps underplay the problems of learning in a crisis situation, with its elements of threat, uncertainty, and urgency (eg Moynihan 2008, 2009; Boin et al 2018). This is even more so for a 'non-routine' or 'less routine' crisis (Moynihan 2008, 2009), where drawing historical analogies (cf Brändström et al (2004) from very different previous Pandemics was of limited value. As noted above, some of the articles stressed the need for urgency, but few stressed the significant level of uncertainty associated with a novel Pandemic.

Conclusions

Application of the criteria of Prospective Policy Transfer (Mossberger and Wolman 2003) suggests that the extent of lesson drawing is fairly limited. It is often not fully clear why nations were selected. Many articles were brief and provided limited detail, meaning that there was little depth on issues such as problems and goals, and on policy performance or policy success or failure. There was limited discussion of transferability or 'fungibility' of lessons (Rose 1991), and few clear and specific lessons could be drawn. Finally, the extent to which it was possible to learn lessons in a non-routine' or 'less routine' crisis, under conditions of threat, uncertainty, and urgency was generally not discussed. Future lessons need to be less international or historical analogies (cf Brändström et al 2004), but rather to fit with the criteria of Prospective Policy Transfer (Mossberger and Wolman 2003). Williams and Dzhekova (2014) conclude that successful policy transfer and cross-national policy learning must be informed by prospective policy analysis. This article has suggested that studies generally do not closely match the criteria of prospective policy transfer (Mossberger

and Wolman 2003). With the additional problems of crisis-decision making under conditions of threat, uncertainty, and urgency, it is clear that lessons are unlikely to be learned.

References

- Bennett, C. and Howlett, M. (1992), "The Lessons of Learning: Reconciling Theories of Policy Learning and policy change," *Policy Sciences*, Vol 25, pp. 275–294.
- Boin, A., 't Hart, P. and Kuipers, S. (2018), "The Crisis Approach", in H. Rodríguez et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Disaster Research*, Springer, 23- 38.
- Brändström, A., Bynander, F. and 't Hart, P. (2004). "Governing by Looking Back: Historical Analogies and Crisis Management." *Public Administration*, Vol 82, No 1, pp. 191–210.
- Dergiades, T., Milas, C. and Panagiotidis, T. (2020), Effectiveness of Government Policies in Response to the COVID-19 Outbreak (Early View).
- Drisko J, and Maschi T. (2016), *Content Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heikkila, T. and Gerlak, A. (2013), "Building a conceptual approach to collective learning: lessons for public policy scholars", *Policy Studies Journal*, Vol 41, No 4, pp. 484–512.
- Legrand, T. (2012), "Overseas and over here: Policy transfer and evidence-based policymaking", *Policy Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 329–48
- Mossberger, K. and Wolman, H. (2003), "Policy transfer as a form of prospective policy evaluation: challenges and recommendations", *Public Administration Review*, Vol 63, No. 4, pp. 428–41.

Moynihan, D. (2009), "From intercrisis to intracrisis learning", *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 189–98.

Moynihan, D. (2008), "Learning under Uncertainty: Networks in Crisis Management", *Public Administration Review*, Vol 68, No 2, pp. 350–361.

Rose, R. (1993), *Lesson-drawing in public policy: A guide to learning across time and space*, Chatham, NJ: Chatham House Publishers.

Rose, R. (1991), "What is lesson-drawing", *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol 2, No 1, pp. 3–30.

Rosenthal, U., Charles, M. T., & 't Hart, P. (Eds.) (1989), *Coping with crises: The management of disasters, riots and terrorism*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers.

Vagionaki, T and Trein, P. (2019), "Learning in Political Analysis", *Political Studies Review*, (Early View) 1 –16.

Weible, C., Nohrstedt, D., Cairney, P., Carter, D., Crow, D., Durnová, A., Heikkila, T., Ingold, K., McConnell, A. and Stone, D. (2020) "COVID-19 and the policy sciences", *Policy Sciences*, Vol. 53, pp. 225-241.

Williams, C. and Dzhekova, R. (2014) "Evaluating the cross-national transferability of policies: a conceptual framework", *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 1-18.

Wolman, H. and Page. E. (2002), "Policy Transfer among Local Governments: An Information-Theory Approach", *Governance*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 477–501.

Search References

- de Bruin, Y. Lequarre, A. McCourt, J. Clevestig, P. Pigazzani, F., Jeddi, M. Colosio, C. and Goulart, M. (2020), "Initial impacts of global risk mitigation measures taken during the combatting of the COVID-19 pandemic", *Safety Science*, Vol. 128,
- Chen, Z. Cao, C. and Yang, G. (2020), Coordinated multi-sectoral efforts needed to address the COVID-19 pandemic: lessons from China and the United States, *Global Health Research and Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 22,
- Duong, D. Le, VT. Ha, BTT. (2020), "Controlling the COVID-19 Pandemic in Vietnam: Lessons From a Limited Resource Country", *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Health*, pp. 1 –2,
- Edelman¹, J. Aoun-Barakat, L. Villanueva, M. and Friedland, G. (2020), "Confronting Another Pandemic: Lessons from HIV can Inform Our COVID-19 Response", *AIDS and behaviour*, Vol. 24, pp. 1977-1979
- Foreman, R. Atun, R. Mckee, M. Mossialos, E. (2020), "12 lessons learned from the management of the Coronavirus pandemic", *Health Policy*, Vol. 124, pp.577-580
- Ha, KM. (2020), "A Lesson Learned from the Outbreak of COVID-19 in Korea, *Indian Journal of Microbiology*, Vol. 60, No. 3 pp. 396–397.
- Hasselgren , P. (2020), "The Smallpox Epidemics in America in the 1700s and the Role of the Surgeons: Lessons to be Learned During the Global Outbreak of COVID-19", *World Journal of Surgery*, Vol. 44, pp. 2837–2841.
- Islam, S. Abdus, S. Akter, M. Nazmul, K. Hussain, N. Toniolo, A. and Rahman, T. (2020), "Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, lessons to be learned!", *Journal of Advanced Veterinary and Animal Research*, Vol. 7, No.2, pp. 260–280.

Jaiswal, J. Loschiavo and Perlman, D. (2020), "Disinformation, Misinformation and Inequality-Driven Mistrust in the Time of COVID-19: Lessons Unlearned from AIDS Denialism", *AIDS and Behaviour*,

Jhaveri, R. (2020), "Echoes of 2009 H1N1 Influenza Pandemic in the COVID Pandemic", *Clinical Therapeutics*, Vol.42, No.5, pp. 736-739.

Jones, D. (2020), "History in a Crisis-Lessons for Covid-19", *The New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 382 No. 18, pp. 1681-1683.

Lee, V. Chiew, C. and Khong, WX. (2020) "Interrupting transmission of COVID-19: lessons from containment efforts in Singapore", *Journal of Travel Medicine*, Vol.27, No. 3,

Marshall, J. Scott, B. Delva, J. Adel, C. Hernandez, S. Patel, J. Moreno-Cheek, M. Rojas, D. Tanner, J.. and Kirby, R. (2020), "An Evaluation of Florida's Zika Response Using the WHO Health Systems Framework: Can We Apply These Lessons to COVID-19?", *Maternal and Child Health Journal*,

Moon, J. (2020), "Fighting COVID-19 with Agility, Transparency, and Participation: Wicked Policy Problems and New Governance Challenges", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 80, No. 4, pp. 651-656.

Oh, J. Lee, JK, Schwarz, D. Ratcliffe, H. Markuns, J. and Hirschhorn, L. (2020), "National Response to COVID-19 in the Republic of Korea and Lessons Learned for Other Countries", *Health Systems & Reform*.

Olagniera, D. and Mogensen, T. (2020) "The Covid-19 pandemic in Denmark: Big lessons from a small country", *Cytokine and Growth Factor Reviews*, Vol.15, pp. 10-12

Rahimi, F. and Talebi Bezmin Abadi, A. (2020), "Tackling the COVID-19 Pandemic", *Archives of Medical Research*, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 468-470.

- Romagnani, P. Gnone, G. Guzzi, F. Negrini, S. Guastalla, A. Annunziato, F. Romagnani, S. and De Palma, R. (2020), "The COVID-19 infection: lessons from the Italian experience", *Journal of Public Health Policy*,
- Ruiu, M. (2020), "Mismanagement of Covid-19: lessons learned from Italy, *Journal of Risk Research*,
- Wilson, S. (2020), "Pandemic leadership: Lessons from New Zealand's approach to COVID-19" *Leadership*, Vol. 16, No. 3 pp.279–293.